

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—On and after January 1, 1875, the daily and weekly editions of the New York Herald will be sent free of postage.

THE DAILY HERALD, published every day in the year. Four cents per copy. Annual subscription price \$12.

All business or news letters and telegraphic despatches must be addressed New York Herald.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

Letters and packages should be properly sealed.

LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.

Subscriptions and advertisements will be received and forwarded on the same terms as in New York.

VOLUME XL.....NO. 98

AMUSEMENTS TO-NIGHT.

MRS. CONWAY'S BROOKLYN THEATRE.
English Opera.—JALISMAN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Mrs. Kellogg.

WOOD'S MUSEUM.
Broadway, corner of Thirtieth Street.—THE BLACK HAND, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Matinee at 2 P. M.

THEATRE CONIQUE.
No. 314 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.
West Fourth Street.—Open from 9 A. M. to 5 P. M.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE.
Fulton Avenue.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

BRYANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
West Twenty-third Street, near Sixth Avenue.—NEGRO MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Dan Bryant.

GERMANIA THEATRE.
Fourth Street, near Broadway.—LA SINFONIA, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Miss Anna May.

OLYMPIC THEATRE.
No. 24 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

ROMAN HIPPODROME.
Fourth Avenue, corner of Twenty-ninth Street.—VISIONS OF THE FUTURE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Menagerie open at 1 P. M. and 3 P. M.

BOWERY OPERA HOUSE.
No. 201 Bowery.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.
Twenty-fifth Street, near Broadway.—THE BIG ROMANZA, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

PARK THEATRE.
Broadway, near Sixth Avenue.—AT 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Mr. Mayo.

GRAND CENTRAL THEATRE.
No. 333 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

BOWERY THEATRE.
Bowery.—AROUND THE WORLD IN EIGHTY DAYS, at 8 P. M.

GRAND OPERA HOUSE.
Ninth Avenue, near Twenty-third Street.—ALHAMBRA, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

BOOTH'S THEATRE.
Corner of Twenty-third Street and Sixth Avenue.—HENRY V., at 8 P. M.; closes at 11 P. M. Mr. Rigold.

LYCEUM THEATRE.
Fourth Street, near Sixth Avenue.—LA JOLIE PARFUMEUSE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Miss Anna May.

SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS.
Broadway, corner of Twenty-ninth Street.—NEGRO MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

TRIVOLI THEATRE.
Ninth Street, near Second and Third Avenues.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

WALLACE'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—ROMANCE OF A YOUNG MAN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Mr. Montague.

COLOSSEUM.
Broadway and Thirty-fourth Street.—PARIS BY NIGHT. Two exhibitions daily, at 2 and 8 P. M.

QUADRUPLE SHEET.

NEW YORK, TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1875.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

Owing to the pressure of advertisements on the columns of our Sunday editions we are obliged to request advertisers to send in advertisements intended for the Sunday Herald during the week and early on Saturdays, thereby insuring a proper classification.

From our reports this morning the probabilities are that the weather to-day will be clear.

WALL STREET YESTERDAY.—The stock market was unsteady, especially in some of the "fancies." Money was firmer at 5 and 6 per cent. Foreign exchange was strong. Gold advanced to 114½, and closed at 114½.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?—The pardon of Ingersoll, the Tammany chairmaker, by Governor Tilden.

EDUCATION IN SPAIN.—The professors and students of the Spanish universities are said to be united in opposing the new educational laws, and intend to make a general demonstration. But the young Alfonso ought not to be blamed. The boy has just left school himself and naturally wishes to be revenged upon his books.

A THREATENED NUISANCE.—In a communication which we publish to-day will be found a statement of facts of which the Health Board should take cognizance, if that body wish to fulfil their duties toward the public. It appears that abattoirs have been established on the North River in a district where the slaughtering of animals and the disposal of the refuse of the dead carcasses may seriously interfere with the public health during the warm weather. It is a subject fraught with interest to the city, and demands imperatively instant investigation.

THE LADY WASHINGTON RECEPTION TO-NIGHT.—Now that we are nearing the celebration of our Centennial, the social event at the Academy this evening must prove particularly interesting, especially as it is combined with one of our most deserving charities. The court of the first and the most revered lady who ever presided at the White House, which so many historic personages graced with their presence, will be faithfully reproduced, and the succeeding tea party will be an agreeable reminiscence of those days when there were nobility and honor in high places, and salary grades, third terms and official backslidings were unheard of. The preparations for this event have been of the most elaborate and extensive kind, and it is to be hoped that the proceeds will be ample enough to enable St. John's Guild to pursue its good work.

The Democratic Victory in Connecticut.

The democrats won in Connecticut yesterday what will pass in their party organs for a great victory. They have elected their State ticket, a majority of the Legislature and three of the four Congressmen. Barnum (democrat) is re-elected in the Fourth district, Hawley (republican) defeated in the First, and Kellogg (republican) defeated in the second, Starkweather in the third district being the only republican Congressman elected. The democratic majority on the State ticket is somewhat smaller than it was a year ago. The gain of Congressmen does not count as compared with the election of last year when members of Congress were not chosen. Two years ago, when members of the Forty-third Congress were elected in Connecticut, the reaction against the republican party had not set in, and a comparison of the Congressional vote throws no light on the question whether the political current continues to move in the same direction and with the same force as it did in the surprising revolution which electrified the country last autumn. In the spring of 1873 President Grant had just been inaugurated a second time, after a triumphant re-election; the democratic party, still smarting under the great Greeley defeat, was in a state of prostration; business seemed prosperous, the panic not occurring until nearly six months later, and the republicans had accordingly every advantage in the April election that year in Connecticut. A gain of Congressmen now, under circumstances so different, proves nothing respecting the state of public feeling in 1875 as compared with 1874. It is only by gains or losses between this year and last that anything can safely be inferred as to the growth or decline of parties and the present drift of political sentiment. All comparisons are idle except those founded on the vote of 1874, when no Congressmen were elected. We must compare State ticket with State ticket, and 1875 with 1874, to find whether the Connecticut democracy is in a state of progress or decay.

It appears by the returns thus far received that the democratic party very nearly holds its own as compared with last year. Eighty-one towns which last year gave Ingersoll a plurality of 2,093 over his republican competitor give him this year a plurality of 1,864, and if this ratio prevails through the State the democratic loss from last year is not serious. There is a much fuller vote than in 1874, but the gains by both parties are nearly equal. In the eighty-one towns already referred to the increase of the democratic vote is 2,278, and the increase of the republican vote 2,507—a neck-and-neck race so far as mere gains are concerned. According to the natural progress of political revolutions the democratic party should have made great gains instead of trifling losses. The splendid victories in other States last year ought to have helped them; the recent military interference with the Louisiana Legislature should have brought them additional votes; the republican blunder of running a servile supporter of Grant for the Governorship gave them an advantage which ought to have increased their majority. And yet, instead of gaining thousands, they have not held their majority of last year. They stand where they did, or rather not quite as well as they did, one year ago, when the "tidal wave" had scarcely begun to move. They are entitled to rejoice over the defeat of Hawley and Kellogg for Congress, but that is only a gain as compared with the spring of 1873, when the republican party had just elected a President and was in the full tide of undiminished success.

The arrest of democratic gains in the opening elections of the year is fortunate for the party—fortunate, we mean, if it shall have the good sense to accept the valuable lesson it teaches. The democratic party has been under a hallucination as to the causes of its great victories last year. The checks to its progress, first in New Hampshire and now in a slighter degree in Connecticut, ought to dispel illusions. The mistake has consisted in attributing last year's successes to a reaction in the public mind in favor of that type of democracy known as Bourbonism, which learns nothing and forgets nothing. The republicans who assisted the democracy last year by staying sullenly away from the polls, or who strengthened it by voting for the democratic candidates, did not renounce, and never meant to be understood as renouncing, any principle for which they contended during the war or the great reconstruction controversy which absorbed public attention for the ensuing five or six years. In voting for democratic candidate last year, or in giving them indirect support by declining to vote, the disaffected republicans still "kept the faith" to which they were pledged by their antecedents. The direct support of the democracy by some of them and the indirect support by others had a double object. It was one part of their intention to give a warning to the republican party and teach it the necessity of reforming abuses if it expected to retain its hold on the country. This was the view of those republicans who simply abstained from voting. The other part of the intention was to satisfy the democratic party that it might hope for the support of former republicans if it accepted in good faith the results of the war, letting bygones be bygones, and addressing itself to administrative reforms. This was the view of such former republicans as voted with the democracy. The falling back into the republican ranks of either of these classes would leave the democratic party as hopeless and imbecile as it was during the war and in the Presidential elections of 1868 and 1872. The democratic leaders perpetrated the blunder of regarding the temporary republican recruits as converts to Bourbonism, and they are beginning to reap the consequences of so senseless a mistake. In Connecticut they elected Mr. Eaton, a dyed-in-the-wool Bourbon, to the Senate; in Missouri they flung out Mr. Schurz, a statesman of great ability, whom they might have attached to their party, and gave the seat to an inflationist. Such displays of Bourbonism have alienated thousands of voters who might otherwise have acted steadily with the democratic party.

This strange want of political penetration is

also exhibited in the blindness of the democratic leaders to the main cause of the surprising revolution which turned their heads last year. The great democratic victories were chiefly due to the panic and the stagnation which followed. The "tidal wave" was set in motion by the panic, and now, when the panic has spent its force and business begins to revive, the progress of the "tidal wave" is arrested. Every other cause to which the democratic party organs and stump orators ascribe their successes last year was in full operation long before the panic commenced, and has lost none of its force. Not even the third term has been renounced, and on other subjects President Grant is more justly exposed to damaging criticism than he was last autumn, when the elections were so unfavorable to his administration. His action in the South was far more acceptable in the early part of last year than it has been this year. Last year he promptly refused to interfere in Texas; he avoided interference in Arkansas as long as he could, and when he did act his course met the general approbation of both parties. But this year his military intervention in Louisiana and Mississippi has exposed him to a great deal of well-founded denunciation. These causes ought to have made the democratic victory in Connecticut greater than it is, especially as the republican party strongly endorsed the President. But the panic and business stagnation, which have heretofore helped the democracy more than any other cause, are beginning to abate, and if there should be a considerable revival of business, extending and growing through the season, the party will find it more difficult to make converts than in the autumn elections of last year.

The result of the Connecticut election gives the democratic party no reason for discouragement if its leaders will have the wisdom to abjure Bourbonism once for all, and if their opponents shall persist in their allegiance to Grant in spite of his third term aspirations. In New Hampshire the republicans repudiated the third term and recovered the State. By pursuing the same course they might have recovered Connecticut, whereas, in consequence of endorsing Grant, they have barely made a small reduction of the democratic majority of last year. If in next fall's elections the republicans resolutely and unequivocally throw Grant's third term aspirations overboard the renewed business activity which must by that time have taken place will enable them to recover a great deal of the ground they lost last year. They might have done better in Connecticut than they did in New Hampshire if they had cast off the heavy load of Grantism with which they were handicapped.

Disraeli and Bismarck.

We published yesterday a piece of news which deserved more attention than it probably received. This was the speech of Mr. Disraeli in Parliament contradictory of the rumor that he had apologized to Prince Bismarck for saying that an English workman enjoyed privileges which foreign noblemen did not. The Count Von Arnim had just been arrested, and these words were thought to refer to that arbitrary measure. Mr. Disraeli took an appropriate occasion—the debate on the Irish Coercion bill—to say that when he made that remark he was no more thinking of Prince Bismarck than of Rory O'More. This apology only aggravates his offence.

Does the English Premier think it proper to tantalize his German brother in this way? Wars have often been caused by smaller events, and Bismarck is known to be quite sensitive. As soon as he learned that Mr. Disraeli thought no more of him than of Rory O'More he inquired who that individual was. Now, there are two Rories in Irish history. One of them was the leader of a rebellion, and the other courted Kathleen Bawn, and tressed her till "Yerra, Rory, be aisy!" sweet Kathleen would cry. It is not likely that Bismarck will be complimented by the comparison to either of them. He has just threatened Belgium, and as it is but a step over through Holland to Great Britain there is no knowing what he may do if Mr. Disraeli keeps up such unpleasant classifications.

So much for Bismarck. On the other side, the Irish have a very high opinion of both of the Rory O'Mores, and doubtless are indignant when Mr. Disraeli proclaims in the House of Commons that he thinks no more of the Rories than of Bismarck. They feel the affront more keenly because it is given at a time when the policy of coercion which one of the Rories resisted is resumed. We are much afraid that the Premier has got himself into a bad box. On the one hand is Bismarck enraged at being compared with Rory, and on the other is Rory furious at being likened to Bismarck.

THE JACINTO TO MEXICO.—Some of our newspapers are making a great noise because a revenue cutter has taken some of our Senators and their families to Vera Cruz, and we are told about the corruption of the government, about the vessels becoming pleasure yachts, about the waste of public money and so on. We do not care much about these complaints. These revenue cutters are used for all sorts of purposes—firemen's excursions up and down the bay, for giving tired politicians a pleasant time, and if the government chooses to send one across the Gulf of Mexico it is a small matter. These picaresque criticisms upon the acts of the administration do no good, and only weaken the effects of just criticism when censure is needed. If President Grant does nothing worse than allow a revenue cutter to sail around the Gulf of Mexico with a party of Senators he will retire from public life with universal esteem. We think it is Carlyle who says that one of the most necessary things for man to do is to clean his soul of cant; and there is nothing that is more offensive to us than these canting criticisms upon the acts of the government.

THE PRESIDENT has given his opinion upon Mexican affairs with more than usual freedom. He says there is no present reason for apprehending war, but, of course, no one could tell what might happen in the future. In the meanwhile the frontier is to be protected, and the attention of the Mexican government officially called to the recent raids.

The Brooklyn Medical Tragedy.

In the melancholy tragedy just enacted in Brooklyn in the name of science and medical treatment there are some grave lessons, equally important to the medical profession and to the public. Perhaps the most obviously important lesson touches the great differences that may exist between different specimens of what is nominally the same medicine. At the office of Dr. Agnew Mr. Walker took one hundred and eighty drops of the extract of conium without notable effect. At his own home he took one hundred and fifty minims and was killed. Ordinarily the word "minim" is used in this connection as more formal than the word "drop"; but if the minims were measured in the graduated glass the one hundred and fifty minims might have been equal in fluid quantity to the one hundred and eighty drops. But if they were the same in quantity, how different in effect were the two specimens of medicine! Conium, as sold in the apothecary shops, is commonly inert, and this experience of its worthlessness has even led many writers on the materia medica to treat as delusion the accounts of its effects put on record by the older physicians. As the ordinary extracts are made in Europe, the inactivity which is their common characteristic may be due to defective processes in the manufacture, to adulteration or to age, and the consequent destruction of the energetic elements of the substance. Evidently the hundred and eighty drops were from a specimen of this inert sort. But Squibb's extracts are not like those that have been stowed away in gallipots in somebody's musty shop for half a century, and his extract of conium was as vigorous as all the medicines that come from his laboratory are known to be. It may indeed have been made from the plant as it grows in this country; but the great difference between such a medicine as found in the shops and the same medicine as prepared in an establishment like Squibb's is a fact of which every practitioner would seem likely to take notice, and we anticipate some material correction in the history of the case.

But the case also involves an important lesson on the wisdom of giving virulent poisons in only tentative doses in every case where it is possible that there may be an error in the diagnosis—that is to say in cases where those conditions may really not be present upon the presumed presence of which the propriety of giving a certain medicine is based. Fifty minims of Squibb's extract prostrated this man. It was four or five times as much as any healthy person could take with impunity at a dose. But he took a hundred more subsequently, and he had taken one hundred and eighty drops a short time before—say three hundred and sixty drops in all between two and six o'clock of the same afternoon—with just a possibility that the first one hundred and eighty were not absolutely inert, but came with cumulative effect upon the operation of that whose greater activity started the train of symptoms. If the man's brain and spine were in a normal physiological condition the prescription pointed the way to certain death. If they were in a disordered state there was the probability that they would not be reduced to paralysis, but might be only reduced so far as to insure quiet and regular action. But the result points to the fact that the exaggerated nervous action upon which the use of the powerful sedative was based did not exist; that undue action of the great nervous centres was not the source of the spasmodic trouble. Life itself began to yield while the twitching of the facial muscles was still in full play, and they were evidently, therefore, beyond the reach of the medicine that was violent enough to completely paralyze those important nerves upon which the action of the heart and the muscles of respiration depend. In short, the result points to a diagnosis that might have saved Dr. Brown-Séguard many searings and scorings of this victim of erroneous theory.

The Position of Mr. Beecher.

The trial in Brooklyn has long since passed out of the ordinary rules which govern actions at law. The general custom on the part of the press not to comment upon cases before a court and jury has not been followed by our journals in dealing with Mr. Beecher. We think it is a mistake in many ways, but the blame does not rest with the press. The trial of Mr. Beecher has never been a purely legal proceeding, either by plaintiff or defendant. Both gentlemen addressed themselves to the public, in statements, in cards and "interviews" and strenuous efforts to manufacture and stimulate public opinion. Mr. Tilton himself did a vast amount of work in this direction, and with great effect, for he succeeded in forming a party against the most adverse circumstances, a party that will sustain him whether he wins or loses. Mr. Beecher has not been so fortunate in affecting public opinion, probably because he has not been so industrious, and partly also because he is in the position of a strong man surrounded by a multitude of friends, sustained by wealth, position and influence, while his antagonist seems to be alone in the world, without money or friends.

Since we are, therefore, all discussing the Beecher case, there is one point that we think should be made, and it is this:—While Mr. Beecher is on the stand let him have the full benefit of his evidence. Many of our journals are discussing Mr. Beecher's evidence as though he must necessarily be lying. Nothing could be more unfair, not only to the defendant but to ordinary justice and fair play. If Mr. Beecher's evidence can be destroyed it will be done by due process of law, either by cross-examination or the evidence of witnesses competent to disprove his allegations. While he is on the stand let him have the protection which all witnesses receive, the same protection from public opinion which is granted by the Judge on the bench. This tendency to look upon every witness as a deliberate perjurer, as a liar and a partisan, is deplorable. Furthermore, in the case of Mr. Beecher we ought also to remember that he is an old man. He has lived many years in this community. He attained a position of personal influence, popularity and religious power which belonged to no other clergyman. For a generation he has been a representative American, a man in whose genius we all felt a pride. He lived for sixty years without a stain upon his name, in high public respect, revered as a teacher of the Gospel, a leader in politics, society and religion. When a man

of this character and of these years enters the witness box, and takes an oath before "the ever living God, the searcher of all hearts," to tell the truth, we should do him the justice to listen to his story and not to insist that every sentence he utters is a lie because it does not tally with our hopes or our prejudices.

We are certainly no partisan of Mr. Beecher. There are many things in his course, even from his own admissions, which we cannot but censure. We like to see fair play. While he is testifying, at least, and speaking under the most solemn circumstances that can surround a citizen, it is the height of rudeness, not to say injustice, to endeavor to break down his testimony by denunciation. If it is to be broken down let the lawyers do it. But give Mr. Beecher the benefit of his life, of his years, of the fearful responsibility he has at stake, and, above all, of the fact that he is speaking under the solemnity of an oath and in presence of the penalties of the law.

Albany This Week.

The Legislature reassembled last evening, and the present bids fair to be a comparatively quiet week at Albany. The excitement caused by Governor Tilden's canal message has pretty much subsided, and nothing is likely to occur to revive it. Everybody, Canal Ring and all, professes to desire investigation, and everybody is certain to get what he pretends he wants. Before the week ends there will be three committees of investigation fully equipped, namely, Governor Tilden's commission, the joint committee of the Legislature and the committee of the Canal Board, which is very much as if three different grand juries were applied to at the same time to find a bill of indictment founded on the same evidence and subject matter. This multitude of investigating bodies, each acting independently of the others, has its ridiculous side. They are all to have power to send for papers and documents, subpoena witnesses, administer oaths and to punish for contempt. Now, supposing it should happen that each commission or committee should subpoena some witness—say Jarvis Lord—before it for examination on the same day, which of the three subpoenas would he obey? If he goes before the joint committee, will the Governor's commission issue a warrant to bring him by force? Will witnesses be imprisoned for contempt by two of the three investigating bodies because they prefer to testify before the third? Are the competing committees to tug and haul for the possession of persons and papers like the dogs in Homer around a fresh hide, each pulling a different way? Courts of justice avoid such conflicts, because three courts never sit at once to try the same criminal or conduct the same investigation. The truth is that one committee of investigation, if it be competent and honest, is as good as a dozen; and if they are not honest, they may throw endless impediments in each other's way by their equal and conflicting rights to persons and papers at the same time. The public will have confidence in Governor Tilden's commission of four, and it is simply preposterous to put two rival committees in the field to make precisely the same inquiries relating to the same subject.

We suppose Governor Tilden will send the names of the Commissioners to the Senate for confirmation in the course of the day. There would be some mortification and loss of prestige if any of them should be rejected, as it would expose the Governor to charges of partisan bias or want of fairness, which, however unfounded, would more or less impair his influence. He will, therefore, be likely to proceed with great caution, making no selection until he has first satisfied himself that awkward accusations having the least color of truth cannot be suddenly sprung upon any of his appointees. If any of them should have a vulnerable spot the Canal Ring would be quite certain to detect and proclaim it. The members of the legislative joint committee were announced last evening, by Speaker McGuire on the part of the Assembly and Lieutenant Governor Dorsheimer on the part of the Senate. Two of the three Senators appointed decline to serve, so the committee is not yet complete. Beyond the completion of the joint committee and the nomination and confirmation of the Governor's commission there is little prospect of anything being done at Albany this week relating to the canal controversy.

"THE OLDEST LAWYER IN THE WORLD."—A sketch of the oldest lawyer in the country, and perhaps in the world, will be found in our columns this morning. The Hon. Elbert Herring, whose career is now sketched, has celebrated his ninety-eighth birthday. He remembers New York when the city did not extend much beyond Ann street, and when the best people resided below Wall street, and when Bridewell jail stood on the site of the City Hall, and when the city was not half the size of Newark. Mr. Herring has lived in New York for more than ninety years, was admitted to the Bar in 1798, and was a judge of the Marine Court the year Napoleon became Emperor of France. Charles O'Connor, now an old and illustrious man, was a student in his office. Mr. Herring was also Commissioner of Indian Affairs—the first that held the position. The presence of a man like Mr. Herring among us, who lived in a world which seems to have rolled into a distant past, is a poetic illustration of the centennial time upon which we have fallen. Lives like these are monuments, and should be cherished.

GENERAL BUTLER has written a letter, which is quoted in our Washington despatches, denying that he uses his personal influence for the purpose of securing federal appointments for his friends. On the contrary, he says that since his Congressional term expired he has not thought it proper to interfere in such matters, and it was no doubt with a sardonic recollection of the scores of applications made to him that he adds, "I have no doubt that you regret this result which the election of last fall has brought about." We have no doubt of it either, for with all his faults General Butler had the habit of taking good care of his friends.

WHAT THE POLICE MIGHT PREVENT.—A correspondent, following the suggestions which have been made in the Herald, says that our policemen might be made to do an incalculable amount of good if, in addition to patrolling their beats, they would attend to other

matters of vital interest to the public—such as causing street obstructions to be removed, keeping crossings clear and paying attention to the condition of street lamps. There are hundreds of nuisances in this city which a little attention on the part of the police would remove. As it is, the force seem to devote their energies solely to lounging around when no disturbance occurs, and to an inordinate use of their clubs when some helpless wayfarers happen to stagger or stumble.

Spring.

Of all the seasons Spring is the most coquettish. She is like the princess who stooped and kissed the sleeping poet under the tree, who still slept on but dreamed a different dream. The earth was hardly conscious that spring had come till yesterday, when blue skies dropped ethereal mildness (Thomson) on her bosom. It is indeed the time when the young, the rosy spring gives to the breeze her scented wing (Anacron) and April is garlanded with all the fairest flowers and freshest buds the earth brings forth (Spenser). Well was it observed that like an army defeated the snow hath retreated (Wordsworth) and that the fields with flowers are decked in every hue (Drummond), though we must not go out just yet to pull them. The swallow also brings us the season of vernal delight, with his back all of sable and belly of white (Anonymous), and there are daffodils which come before the swallow dares and take the winds of March with beauty (Shakespeare). In the spring a brighter crimson burns upon the robin's breast (Tennyson), and a young man's fancy lightly turns to thoughts of love (Ibid). Now is heard the sound of vernal showers on the twinkling grass (Shelley), and with his umbrella wanders forth the hyacinthine boy, for whom warm well might break and April bloom (Emerson). Now shall we notice how our swift Spring leaps the orchards full of bloom and scent (Lowell), and the maiden May returns with a pretty haste (Barry Cornwall). Now do the majority of intelligent people think it better to sport with Amoryllis in the shade or with the tangles of Nemra's hair (Milton) than to creep into some still cavern deep, there to weep and weep and weep (Tennyson). All these and many other things do we see and enjoy now that Spring has broken the icy fetters of the silver streams (Wildebarre special despatch), and all nature rejoices that grim-visaged March has smoothed his frosty pow (Burns and Shakespeare). Spring! beautiful Spring! has returned with birds and flowers (original), and new fashionable styles in hats, bonnets, dresses (advertisements), influenzas and catarrhs and hundreds of other things make business lively. Much more might be said of Spring, but her lovely and bewitching smiles of yesterday show that at last she has consented to speak for herself.

AUSTRIA AND ITALY.—The visit of the Emperor of Austria to Italy, and his reception by the King at Venice, are important only because of the past relations of the two countries. A few years ago the Italians, and none of them more than the Venetians, hated Austria because she held them in subjugation. Now we are told that the Emperor was received with enthusiasm, as a foreign guest, by a people who always rejected him as a ruler. There is a lesson in this reconciliation which other nations, and England particularly, would do well to heed.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

The new opera house in Paris cost \$10,000,000. General Sir Hope Grant played upon the fiddle. Mayor Charles M. Reed, of Erie, Pa., is staying at the Fifth Avenue Hotel. Rev. Phillips Brooks, of Boston, is residing temporarily at the Windsor Hotel. Bishop Gilbert Haven, of Georgia, has taken up his residence at the Fifth Avenue Hotel. General Sheridan is at New Orleans, probably on account of the Mexico-Texas border troubles. Captain L. Moragues, of the Spanish Ordnance Commission, is quartered at the Hoffman House. Postmaster General Marshall Jewell was in this city for a short time last evening, on the way from Hartford to Washington. General Albert G. Lawrence, of Rhode Island, formerly United States Minister to Costa Rica, is sojourning at the Fifth Avenue Hotel. Congressman James G. Blaine returned to this city last evening from a brief campaign in Connecticut and is at the Fifth Avenue Hotel. Mr. Francis Thomas, of Maryland, has resigned the office of Minister to Peru. His Excellency the President has not yet selected his successor. M. Jules Bernes, a Frenchman, Czarist correspondent of the French Journal de l'Est, has been captured and shot by some of Alfonso's volunteers.

Germany's military forces, including those of Bavaria, comprise at this moment 31,500 officers, 1,225,000 men, 314,970 horses, 2,700 field and 830 siege pieces of cannon.

Mr. Charles Albright, recently Congressman-at-Large from Pennsylvania, is at the Grand Central Hotel. Mr. Albright has ceased to be a Congressman, though he still remains at large.

The commission of Mr. John C. New, of Indiana, recently appointed Treasurer of the United States, to take effect from June 30 next, was signed by His Excellency the President yesterday and forwarded to Indianapolis.

All the guns on the great ram Thunderer will be worked by machinery. If they keep on increasing the dimensions of iron-clad the notion of men handling them at all will be comparable to ants running a windmill.

It is thus that the Madrid Gazette informs the world that Alfonso and his sister are well—"His Majesty the King (who God preserve) and Her Royal Highness the Infanta Donna Isabel continue in this court without novelty in their important health."

The London Athenaeum must pay some £5,000 to an aggrieved publisher, so says the jurmen who tried the case. In their criticism they alleged that the Messrs. Johnson, of Edinburgh, sold some one else's work as A. Keith Johnstone's, and thus imposed on the public.

The Duchess of Edinburgh while out driving was caught in a shower and borrowed an umbrella at a cottage of an old woman, who refused to loan any but the "second best one," and next day the Duchess sent it home with her compliments, one sovereign and a pound of tea.

The report that M. Paul Cassagne had been publicly chastised by a woman was an invention, and first appeared in the *Revenant*. M. Cassagne addresses the editor of that paper by name in this style:—"You attribute to me habits of a café hatter, of a drinker of absinthe, probably imagining that we spend our time as you republicans do, sipping in the pipe-smoke atmosphere of smoking rooms. And, finally, you relate with the most circumstantial details an aggression against me, in which I am made to look like a fool. This morning in your paper you apologize. I refuse your apology. An apology from you is like a bad smelling-louse, which no one will look at. However, there is one thing I wish to tell you—that your paper should be the last to publish these stories about encounters, assaults, duelling, &c., having at its head such a double-dyed coward as yourself, whom I have the honor to assure of my profound contempt."